Redacted Pursuant to Protective Order
at Request of Defendants

Figueira Decl. Tab
5

To: "Thomas Meehan-Ritter" <tritter@google.com>
From: "Wendy Chang" <wchang@google.com>
Cc: "David Rolefson" <drolefson@google.com>
Bcc:
Received Date: 2008-03-11 11:40:01 CST
Subject: Re: FW: [Deal_review] Re: FMG: YT deals under 70%?

I hear you. Given that only 2% of YT playbacks are monetizable, I'm thinking it will take us a long time to get there -- unfortunately. For the most part, the team is trying to give them up to 100% revshares for the first 6 months, and then go back down to the 55% revshare thereafter, so hopefully there won't be too many with high revshares indefinitely.

On Tue, Mar 11, 2008 at 4:24 PM, Thomas Meehan-Ritter <tritter@google.com> wrote:

> That makes sense. Thanks for the additional color, Wendy.
>
> As I'm sure you know, the hard part will be reducing these revenue shares
> over time once we have built up the business. We have been able to get rid
> of most media buys and guarantee deals in AdSense but we haven't had much
> success in reducing revenue shares for Direct partners. Revenue shares have
> only grown over time. We're hoping to reverse that trend this year :)
>
> Thanks,
> -Thomas
>
> ------------------------------
> *From:* Wendy Chang [mailto:wchang@google.com]
> *Sent:* Tuesday, March 11, 2008 1:28 PM
> *To:* Thomas Meehan-Ritter
> *Cc:* David Rolefson
> *Subject:* Re: FW: [Deal_review] Re: FMG: YT deals under 70%?
>
> Hi Thomas --
>
> Thanks for reaching out. The nature of YT business model is very
> different from traditional Adsense business. First, we're still at a very
> nascent stage of our business cycle, and are therefore still trying to
> significantly build our partnership base. I think if you look at
> traditional adsense revshares, you would likely see that we initially gave
> away higher revshares or even guarantees to grow that business initially.
>
> Also, content partners are an essential part of YT business, as they
> provide monetizable inventory for our ad sales team to sell against. Given
> copyright concerns, we don't monetize against user generated content. We
> want to be able to close these big partnerships and hopeful that higher
> revshare will ease that slightly. Further, the higher revshares are thought
> to be an incentive for our partners to claim content (e.g. if a user
> uploads a video that includes partner content, then we want the partner to
> "claim" that video and allow us to monetize against it). We have seen that
> for partners that are incentivized to claim, they generally are doing more
> of it, and thus allowing us to build up monetization.
>
> To be clear, however, the higher revshare are not for all partners. All
> of our torso and user partners are at 55%. The higher revshares are only
> for a select short list of partners, those who would normally request a

Chang
EXHIBIT NO. 37
7.11.08
A. IGNACIO HOWARD CSR,RPR

> guarantee, but in which we are not giving (with exception of music which is 5-0002
> a whole other model, we are not giving any guarantees). EMG has approved to
> go up to 80% revshares for this upper tier of partnerships.
>
> Wendy
>
> On Tue, Mar 11, 2008 at 1:21 PM, Thomas Meehan-Ritter <tritter@google.com>
> wrote:
>
> > Hi Wendy,
> >
> > Do we really want/need to go this high on YT deals? This would be 70%
> > of recognized, right, (with no deductions)?
> >
> > I'm just bringing it up as part of our company-wide initiative to take a
> > hard look at our TAC and find opportunities to reduce TAC margins (while
> > maintaining or increasing Net Revenue on an absolute basis).
> >
> > We have agreed to reduce the Online revenue share for several products
> > (Mobile AFC Online, AdSense for Games Online) and are actively considering a
> > reduction in AFC Online. On the Direct AdSense side, we are working on new
> > revenue share guidelines that will likely decrease TAC by 5 to 10 percentage
> > points across the board.
> >
> > Thanks,
> > -Thomas
> >
> > ------------------------------
> > *From:* David Eun [mailto:deun@google.com]
> > *Sent:* Tuesday, March 11, 2008 10:33 AM
> > *To:* Talia Dear
> > *Cc:* Deal Review Team
> > *Subject:* [Deal_review] Re: FMG: YT deals under 70%?
> >
> > Talia,
> >
> > If I recall, I just reminded Jordan to revise everyone's understanding
> > of our standard YT deals, i.e., from 55% to up to 70%. I think anything
> > "non-standard" should continue to come to FMG, where we can continue to
> > determine whether it makes sense to send to EMG.
> >
> > Agree?
> > D-
> >
> > On Mon, Mar 10, 2008 at 11:02 PM, Talia Dear <talia@google.com> wrote:
> >
> > > Hi Dave, how are you?
> > > I talked with Jordan today - it sounds like you may not want to
> > > continue seeing YT content deals in FMG as long as they are under 70% rev
> > > share (and don't have any other aspects that would send it to FMG). Is this
> > > accurate?
> > >
> > > Let me know if you no longer need to see these deals in FMG -
> > > otherwise, we will continue to send deals with over 55% rev share to FMG
> > > (over 70% / 80% claimed to EMG).
> > >
> > > Thank you, and have a good night!
> > > Talia

> > >
> > >
> > > --
> > > Talia Dear
> > > Google, Inc.
> > > Compliance Specialist
> > > 1600 Amphitheatre Parkway
> > > Mountain View, CA 94043
> > > [redacted]
> > >
> > > "If you received this communication by mistake, please don't forward
> > > it to anyone else (it may contain confidential or privileged information),
> > > please erase all copies of it, including all attachments, and please let the
> > > sender know it went to the wrong person. Thanks."
> >
> >
> >
> >
> > --
> > David Eun
> > NY: 212-565-8070
> > CA: 650-253-1993
> >
> > ============================
> > "CONFIDENTIALITY. This email may be confidential or privileged. If you
> > received this communication by mistake, please don't forward it to anyone
> > else, please erase all copies and attachments, and please let me know that
> > it went to the wrong person. Thank you."
> >
>
>
>
> --
> If you received this communication by mistake, please don't forward it to
> anyone else (it may contain confidential or privileged information), please
> erase all copies of it, including all attachments, and please let the sender
> know it went to the wrong person. Thanks.
>

--
If you received this communication by mistake, please don't forward it to
anyone else (it may contain confidential or privileged information), please
erase all copies of it, including all attachments, and please let the sender
know it went to the wrong person. Thanks.
